

**REPRINTS**  
**FROM**  
**The Journal of Oriental Research**  
**MADRAS**



तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

**PRINTED AT THE MADRAS LAW JOURNAL PRESS**  
**MYLAPORE**

## AN APPEAL.

GENTLEMEN,

In making this appeal to you we wish to inform you that this is the **ONLY JOURNAL** in **SOUTH INDIA**, which is dedicated purely to advanced research in the field of Oriental Learning. We are receiving articles from eminent scholars all over India. Such a journal has an important place in the sphere of higher culture. Due prominence is given to all sides of Oriental Studies.

Moreover, we have undertaken the publication of many rare books which exist only in the form of manuscripts. Sanskrit renderings of *original Buddhistic works* preserved in the *Tibetan Language* are also published for the first time. A critical and readable English Translation of the "*Tolkappiyam*" with illustrations is being published. The articles published in this Journal cover the whole field of Oriental Literature—Linguistics, Philosophy, Literary Criticism, Astronomy, Dravidian Studies, Sastraic Research, etc.

The Annual Subscription is fixed at **Rs. 6**, so as to be within easy reach of everybody. We request you to become subscribers and to help us in enlisting others.

Yours faithfully,

K. BALASUBRAHMANI AIYAR,

*Managing Editor.*

N.B.:—Orders may be sent either to

Mr. K. Balasubrahmani Aiyar, B.A., B.L.,

*"The Ashrama," Luz, Mylapore.*

or to

Mr. T. Chandrasekharan, M.A.,

Manager & Correspondent,

5, North Mada Street, Mylapore, MADRAS.

---

## OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS

### Madras Oriental Series.

1. Vibhrama Viveka of Maṇḍanamiśra. Price As. 8.
2. Viṇāvāsavadattam (available only up to the end of the third act). Price As. 8.
3. Tolkāppiyam.—With English Notes and Translation. Vol. I. Eḷuttatikāram. Price Re. 1.
4. Madhyamakāvatāra of Candrakīrti.—Rendered into Sanskrit from Tibetan version. In the Press.
5. Tripādīnītinayanam of Murārimiśra. In the Press.

“यथोक्तं कात्यायनेन—

‘वीरस्य भुजदण्डानां वर्णने स्रग्धरा भवेत् ।

नायिकावर्णने कार्यं वसन्ततिलकादिकम् ॥

शार्दूललीला प्राच्येषु मन्दाक्रान्ता च दक्षिणे ।’ ”

Vol. II, p. 370.

III. The third writer on Prosody is quoted at the end of the work in some connection.

“यथा शङ्करभक्तिशालिना भट्टशङ्करेण अर्धसमवृत्तप्रकरणे प्रदर्शितम् ।”

Vol. IV, p. 219.

This Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara seems to be a Śaivācārya like Abhinava. A Śaiva called Śaṅkarakaṇṭha is known to us as the father of Ratnakaṇṭha, the author of स्तुतिकुसुमाञ्जलिटीका. Aufrecht mentions two more Śaṅkaras, one, son of Ratnākara and commentator on महिम्नस्तोत्र and another, writer on prosody called शङ्करशर्मन् who wrote a work on metrics called वृत्तमुक्तावली. Mr. R. Kavi is of opinion that the Bhaṭṭa Śaṅkara quoted by Abhinava is a commentator on Chandoviciti.

In the chapter on the Prākṛt, Abhinava mentions three works on Prākṛt grammar, प्राकृतदीपिका, सूत्रवृत्ति, and पद्धति and one writer on Prākṛt grammar called उत्पल.

“विस्तरविजिज्ञासुः प्राकृतदीपिकादिकमुवलोकयेत् । उत्पलविरचितायां सूत्रवृत्तौ पद्धतौ च ।”

Vol. II, p. 423.

The author of the Prākṛtadīpikā is not given and Utpala, whose identity is not known, is given as the author of the two works on Prākṛt grammar, सूत्रवृत्ति and पद्धति. A grammarian Utpala is said to be quoted in the Nyāsa on Hemacandra's Bṛhad Vṛtti (Aufrecht).

## VIJAYA KAMPAVARMAN

BY

T. N. RAMACHANDRAŅ, M.A.,

*Archaeological Assistant, Government Museum, Madras.*

Dr. Hultzsch, while editing four inscriptions from Śolapuram, made the following remarks concerning the place of Vijaya-Kampavikramavarman in Pallava genealogy:—" . . . he was perhaps a son of the Gaṅga-Pallava king Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman and hence belonged to the ninth century of the Christian era."<sup>2</sup> "Nandikampīśvara must have been the ancient name of the temple of Īśvara (Śiva) on which this inscription is engraved. As no other Śiva temple exists at Śolapuram, it may be also identified with the Īśvara temple that was founded during the reign of Vijaya-Kampa according to the inscription A., and the Nandi-Kampa, after whom the Nandikampīśvara temple was called, may be identical with Vijaya-Kampa. As the alphabet of the inscriptions of Vijaya-Kampa, Kampavarman or Vijaya-Kampavikramavarman resembles that of the inscriptions of Vijaya-Dantivikramavarman, Vijaya-Nandivikramavarman and Vijaya-Nṛpatuṅgavikramavarman, I feel tempted to explain Nandi-Kampa by 'Kampa, the son of Nandi,' and to assume that Kampavarman was a son of Nandivikramavarman and a brother of Nṛpatuṅgavikramavarman."<sup>3</sup> Subsequent writers have not added much to our knowledge on this subject. Mr. Gopalan makes in his 'Pallavas' (p. 142) the following remarks: "It is presumed that Kampavarman and Īśvaravarman as well as the other chiefs such as Vayirameghan, whose inscriptions have been discovered at Kāveripākkam, Uttaramallūr, Olakkūr and other parts of the Chingleput District, enjoyed the rule of a part of the Pallava dominions along with Vayirameghavarman". The latest contribution on this subject

---

1. *E. I.*, VII, pp. 192-7.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 192.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 196.

is from Mr. K. V. Subrahmanya Iyer, Superintendent for Epigraphy, Madras, who, while editing three Tamil inscriptions from Lālgudi<sup>1</sup> discusses the place of Kampavarman also at length. He accepts Dr. Hultsch's suggestion and assumes that Kampavarman was another, and perhaps the younger son of Nandivarman III, that Nandivarman III might have also married a daughter of Kambha (or Stambha), the eldest son of the Rāṣtrakūṭa king Dhāravarṣa Dhruva, and the name Kampavarman, just like Nṛpatuṅga, might have been derived from Kambha, the maternal grand-father of Kampavarman. His remarks in determining the period of Kampavarman are: "It may be pointed out here that both the palaeographical peculiarities of Kampavarman's epigraphs and the genealogy furnished by the Velūrpālayam and Bāhūr plates do not admit of any place for him before Nṛpatuṅga. Nor can he be the immediate successor of Nṛpatuṅga. Therefore Kampavarman must have been a joint ruler with either Nṛpatuṅga or Aparājita or with both"<sup>2</sup>. Then he proves that Aparājita was the immediate successor of Nṛpatuṅga<sup>3</sup>, that he was the last Pallava ruler of Kāñcī and that the Cola Āditya I, whose date of accession he determines on astronomical calculations<sup>4</sup> to be 871 A. D., killed him in about 888 A. D. and extended his territory into Toṇḍaināḍu<sup>5</sup>. The dates that he assigns to the later Pallava kings are as follows<sup>6</sup>:—

Nandivarman Pallavamalla	(ruled for 65 years)—696-761 A.D.
Dantivarman	(ruled for 52 years)—761-812 A.D.
Nandivarman III	( " " 32 " )—812-844 "
Nṛpatuṅga	( " " 26 " )—844-870 "
Aparājita	( " " 18 " )—870-888 ,*

In the light of the results arrived at by the writers referred above it would seem that Kampavarman or Vijaya-Kampavarman or Vijaya-Kampavikramavarman was born to Nandivarman III

1. *E. I.*, xx, pp. 46—51.

2. *Ibid.* p. 48-9.

3. *Ibid.* p. 49.

4. *E. I.*, xix, p. 81.

5. *S. I. I.*, Vol. III, No. 89, p. 221.

6. *E. I.*, xx, pp. 49-50.

\* My friend, Mr. M. S. Sarma, will shortly publish a paper revising the dates given here.

before 844 A.D., the last year of the latter's reign, and that he was a 'joint ruler with either Nṛpatuṅga or Aparājita or with both'. If he were a joint ruler with both he should be expected to have also undergone the fate that befell Aparājita in 888 A.D., when Āditya I killed the latter in battle and took possession of his country<sup>2</sup>. On the other hand we find no mention of him in the campaigns of Āditya who had to encounter only Aparājita; this would mean that Kampavarman was not living in 888 A. D., and that he had evidently predeceased Aparājita. To say that he was a joint ruler with Nṛpatuṅga alone would mean that Kampavarman cannot be brought later than 870 A. D., the last year assigned to Nṛpatuṅga by Mr. K. V. S. Iyer. And to say that he was a joint ruler with Aparājita alone would mean that as the second son of Nandivarman III and the younger brother of Nṛpatuṅga, who evidently died childless, he succeeded Nṛpatuṅga in about 870 A. D. In that case Aparājita was a rival of his to the Pallava throne. But it is strange that Āditya, the conqueror of the Pallava dominions, speaks of Aparājita alone as his foe, which would be the case if Kampavarman had predeceased Aparājita. In short the calculations of Mr. K. V. S. Iyer do not give room for the possibility of Kampavarman being brought to a period later than 840-888 A. D., or to speak in round figures later than 890 A. D.

It shall be our endeavour to show here, of course basing our views on the excellent results arrived at by Mr. K. V. S. Iyer, in the light of a few stone inscriptions, that it is possible to bring Kampavarman to the tenth century and to assign him roughly a period between 907-933 A. D.

Out of a horde of inscriptions and materials available on the subject<sup>3</sup> a few may be singled out here for a detailed examina-

1. *E. I.*, xx, pp. 48-9,

2. *S.I.I.*, iii, p. 396, verse 49, 11. 97-8; *E.I.*, xviii, p. 42, verse 55.

3. M. E. Collection nos. 24, 26 of 1893, 251 of 1894, 399 of 1896, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 42, 64, 65, 84, 85, 90 of 1898, 207-8 of 1901, D. 372, D. 374, of 1901-2, 172, 183-4, 429 of 1902, 356 of 1903, 391, 398 of 1905, 345 of 1906, 371-2 of 1911, 104, 126-7, 132, 174, 181, 189, 206, 253 of 1912, 236 of 1913, 283 of 1919, 159 of 1921; *M. E. R.*, 1926, p. 100; *E. I.*, vii, pp. 192-7, xix, p. 81, xx, pp. 46-51, xviii, p. 23; *S. I. I.*, iii, no. 44, ii, no. 20, v, no. 1354; *Bomb. Gaz.*, Vol. I, pt. II, pp. 207, 210, 305, 332, 420-2; *Mys. Gaz.* 1930, Vol. II, pt. II, pp. 753-9.

tion<sup>1</sup>, most of which come from the Ādhipurīśvara temple at Tiruvorriyūr, Saidapet Taluk, Chingleput District. Tiruvorriyūr was a place of great religious sanctity mentioned in the Tēvāram and the Śiva temple in it appears to have attracted several kings to it. From lithic records we learn that the later Pallavas, the Colas and the Vijayanagar monarchs were attracted to the place and recorded many of their donations to the temple on its walls and slabs. Many of these records speak of some of these kings as attending the temple festivals<sup>2</sup>.

No. 372 of 1911 is a record in Tamil of Vijaya-Kampavarman dated in the 19th year of his reign and registers a gift of land by an ascetic called Nirañjana Guravar (*i.e. guru*) of Tiruvorriyūr to the temple of Mahādeva (Śiva) built by the *guru* himself and named after his own name as Nirañjaneśvaram. The god was called "Nirañjaneśvarattu-Mahādevan." It is said that the assembly of Mañali sold the land to the *guru*. The temple is evidently the modern Ādhipurīśvara temple. Tiruvorriyūr was, according to tradition, one of the earliest of religious centres to come under the influence of Śaṅkarācārya's teachings and a hierarchy of ascetics or saṁnyāsins in the order of *guru* and *śiṣya* appears to have been created since then. The doctrine of Soma-siddhānta or Kāpālīka Śaivism found for a long time a congenial home at Tiruvorriyūr and the temple of Śiva there had a regular institution to expound such a despised form of religion. Śaṅkara, it is said, effectively put a stop to the evil practices of this form (which must have included the Śakti worship in some form or other) not only at Tiruvorriyūr but throughout India wherever it was so observed, "and this event is even now gratefully remembered at Tiruvorriyūr in the story that Śaṅkarācārya personally went there and securing the vital energy of an evil goddess who was then swallowing everything that came in her way, threw it into a well (pointed out even now) and closed its mouth with a huge slab. The goddess became powerless and thence forward assumed a calm countenance. Still,

1. M. E. Collection nos. 371 and 372 of 1911, 104, 126, 181, 206 of 1912, 399 of 1896, 283 of 1919, 236 of 1913, 159 of 1921 and M. E. R., 1926. p. 100.

2. For details regarding the great religious and historical importance of this place, together with its temples, maṭhas, pavilions, maṇḍapas etc., the reader is referred to M. E. R., 1912, pp. 67-68; and *ibid*, 1913, pp. 85-7.

once in the year, by way of compromise as it were, the orgiastic rites are observed and the terrible and all-swallowing spirit is believed to be appeased. Śaṅkarācārya too, as a benefactor, is immortalized by a statue placed in the temple and receives regular worship. . ."<sup>1</sup> In all probability the order of saṁnyāsins and gurus including our Nirañjana-guru, was created to stem the evil effects of this Soma-siddhānta and probably owes its origin to the famous reformer Śaṅkara himself, who is said to have created episcopal orders in proper centres as for instance Kāñcīpuram to stem the progress of Buddhism, Jainism and other alien faiths and despised forms of religion such as Soma-siddhānta etc.

The inscription can be said to prove that Nirañjana-guru and Vijaya-Kampavarman were contemporaries. As regards the exact period when this guru lived the late Rai Bahadur Krishna Sastri remarked that he "flourished about the ninth century A.D."<sup>2</sup>. His time can however be determined with a certain amount of exactitude by a reference to the inscriptions of his *śiṣya*, Caturānana-Paṇḍita by name, who appears to have been more popular than his *guru* at least so far as Tiruvorriyūr was concerned. Inscription No. 181 of 1912, also from Tiruvorriyūr, is dated in the 20th year of the reign of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Kaṇṇaradeva-Kṛṣṇa III (938-966 A. D.) and records a gift of money (100 niṣkas of gold) by Caturānana-Paṇḍita, the pupil of Nirañjana-guru, for providing a special worship (*balī*) in the temple at Tiruvorriyūr on the day of Dhaniṣṭhā—the asterism under which he was born. This record is written in Grantha and Tamil, the Tamil portion comprising the gift specified above and the Grantha part containing a few Sanskrit verses detailing the early career of Caturānana-Paṇḍita. This account is of great historical interest and is of particular use to us for our study ; hence a gist of it as found in the Epigraphy report for 1913<sup>3</sup>, is given here.

"He was apparently of Kerala origin and a favourite of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Vallabha (*i.e.* Kṛṣṇa III). Having acquired in his younger days sufficient knowledge of all sciences, he is stated to have come to the Cola country and to have become an intimate friend and subordinate of King Rājāditya. Though he was always near that king, he did not, however die with him in

1. *M. E. R.*, 1912, p. 68.

2. *M. E. R.*, 1913, p. 86.

3. P. 93.



the battle-field. Aggrieved that he had thus 'done a deed inconsistent with the nature of his caste, family, father and master', Caturānana resigned the world, bathed in the waters of the Ganges, entered the order of saṁnyāsins at Ādhigrama (*i.e.* Tiruvorriyūr) receiving initiation (*vrata*) at the hands of Nirañjana-guru and thereafter, becoming the chief of that maṭha, greatly improved the temple." The late Krishna Sastri thought that the story, rightly interpreted, is a reflection on the moral rectitude of the times and that it proves the strategic attack on the life of Rājāditya supposed to have been made by the Rāṣṭrakūṭa king Kṛṣṇa III, with the dishonourable help given by Caturānana-Paṇḍita—perhaps as his spy (?). This narrative of his life history in an inscription set up by himself, appears to imply remorse on the part of Caturānana for some great sin of his. Even if he had not been the spy that Krishna Sastri suggests, he should have come very near it to discard worldly life and become a saṁnyāsin. That he was from the Kerala country and that he had eventually become the benefactor of the temple account "perhaps for the still-existing practice of a Kerala (Malabar) Brāhman worshipping in that temple and of Śaṁkarācārya (also a native of Malabar) receiving special honours. It is not even impossible that the image, now worshipped as Śaṁkarācārya, may be one of Caturānana-Paṇḍita himself.<sup>1</sup>"

That Caturānana was a favourite of Kṛṣṇa III is proved by this record being dated in the 20th year of that king's reign and by the narrative contained in the prefatory verses. That Kṛṣṇa followed the policy laid down by Cāṇakya in the Arthaśāstra (Ch. XIV) in the matter of winning over friends, subordinates and vassals of foreign kings will be apparent from his relations with the Bāṇa Vijayabāhu Vikramāditya III, with the Vaidumba and the Gaṅgas<sup>2</sup>. And Kṛṣṇa, the mighty invader of the south as he was, appears to have united these minor powers by marriage ties and the like<sup>3</sup> so that they can help him against the imperial power of the south, the Cola.

That Takkolam is the battlefield referred to here is apparent, for, according to the Āṭakur inscription, Rājāditya is said to have

1. *M. E. R.*, 1913, p. 94.

2. *J. O. R.*, Vol. V, pt. IV, pp. 309-310.

3. His wife was a Gaṅga princess, Gaṅgamādevī and his brother-in-law the Gaṅga Būṭuga—see *M. E. R.* 1908, no. 65 of App. B.

been killed at Takkolam near Arkoṇam, North Arcot Dt., in Śaka 872 (949—50 A. D.), by Būṭuga, the Gaṅga feudatory of Kṛṣṇa III, who 'undauntedly mounted the elephant on which Rājāditya was seated, and engaging him in hand to hand fight in the howdah itself, stabbed him with a dagger and thus killed him'.<sup>1</sup> The exact year in which this battle is said to have taken place is determined by a record from Śolapuram<sup>2</sup> in which Śaka 871 (949 A. D.) or the second year of the reign of Rājāditya is given as the date in which 'the emperor Kāṇṇaradeva-Vallabha having pierced Rājāditya entered Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam'. From about 950 to 963 A.D., there was no Cola supremacy in the Arcot and Chingleput districts or rather in the Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam which Kṛṣṇa conquered; Kṛṣṇa was then the master of this territory and retained possession of it till 963 A. D. as evidenced by numerous records of his found therein<sup>3</sup>. In a record dated 938 A. D. one Māciyarasa is said to be governing in this year the province of Banavāsi on behalf of Kṛṣṇa III<sup>4</sup>. That he ruled for 28 years is attested by a record from Kāvaṇūr, North Arcot district<sup>5</sup> while another record from Kīlūr gives him 30 years<sup>6</sup>. A third record<sup>7</sup> states that he died in Śaka 889 Kṣaya (966-7 A. D.) and that Khoṭṭiga succeeded him in the same year. Relying on the record from Kīlūr which gives him a rule of 30 years we can put Kṛṣṇa's rule between 937—966-7 A. D. The battle of Takkolam (949 A. D.) should then have taken place in the twelfth year of his reign and not in the tenth<sup>8</sup>.

The turning point in the career of Caturānana was the battle at Takkolam (949 A. D.). Aggrieved that his action cost the life of his 'master' who was Rājāditya, he got rather prematurely the spirit of dissociation (*vairāgya*), resigned the world and bathed in the waters of the Ganges for expiation of the sin committed. Allowing two years for his sojourn to Ganges on a mission of expiation we find him in 951 A. D. an ascetic that had renounced

1. *E. I.*, vi, p. 51.

2. *E. I.*, vii, p. 194.

3. *M. E. R.*, 1926, p. 100; nos. 232 of 1902, 236 of 1913, and 47 of 1925.

4. *Mys. Gaz.*, Vol. II, pt. II, p. 758.

5. *M. E. Coll.*, no. 159 of 1921.

6. *M. E. R.*, 1926, p. 100.

7. *M. E. Coll.*, no. 236 of 1913.

8. *Mys. Gaz.*, Vol. II, pt. II, p. 755.

everything. As renunciation was the key-note of Saṁnyāsa, the fourth stage (*āśrama*) in the life of every twice-born (*dvija*) he hunts for a guru who would give him initiation (*dīkṣā*). The maṭha at Tiruvorriyūr or Ādhigrāma being then famous with Nirañjana-guru at its head, he is admitted into the order of saṁnyāsins at Ādhigrāma by Nirañjana after due ceremony. Some time later he becomes the chief of that maṭha, in other words he succeeds Nirañjana as the head of the order of saṁnyāsins. If it is remembered that Nirañjana was mainly associated with the temple and that Caturānana, after he became the maṭhādhipati, "greatly improved the temple" probably by virtue of his political influence at Kṛṣṇa's court, and that succession in any episcopal or religious order follows the death of the previous incumbent it may be conceded in the case of Caturānana that he became the chief of the maṭha because Nirañjana had died. No better man can be thought of to succeed him than Caturānana—he was himself a great personality with much influence at the Rāṣṭrakūṭa court, was sincere, detached to worldly life and above all was himself a native of Malabar, the land to which the famous Śaṅkara who had much to do with Tiruvorriyūr, as we saw already, also belonged.

We know that Caturānana became a saṁnyāsin even as a youth. How long did he live? The answer to this question is supplied by another record, also from Tiruvorriyūr<sup>1</sup> which records that the vimāna (*i. e.* the central shrine) of the temple was 'constructed of black granite . . . by the architect Ravi surnamed Vira-Cola-takṣan in three tiers with caraṇas, toraṇas, kūṭas, koṣṭas, nīvas (big and small), lion faces and nāsikas" at the bidding of Caturānana, the pupil of Nirañjana-guravar, and under the auspices of Rājendra Cola I (1012—1044 A. D.). The late Krishna Sastri comments on this inscription thus :—"It remains to add . . . that Caturānana-Paṇḍita, the pupil of Nirañjana-guravar, who flourished about the 9th century A. D., substantially improved the temple. Under his direct supervision and with the patronage of King Rājendra-Cola I (A. D. 1012 to at least 1042) was built the now-existing central shrine (*vimāna*) of the temple."<sup>2</sup> (No. 126 of App. B.) This inscription makes Caturānana also contemporaneous with Rājendra I, and indicates that

1. No. 126 of 1912.

2. *M. E. R.* 1913, p. 86.

he should have lived for a long time. If he were 20 in 949 A. D. when the battle of Takkolam took place he should be 83 in 1012 A. D., the date of Rājendra's accession.

There are three other records from the same temple speaking of a Caturānana Paṇḍita as the maṭhādhipati.<sup>1</sup> A fourth record<sup>2</sup> speaking of a Caturānana Paṇḍita is the same as No. 104 of 1912. That these records speak of two different Caturānanas, evidently successors of our Caturānana in the maṭha at Tiruvorriyūr, will become apparent as we shall examine now.

No. 104 of 1912 is a record of Parakesarivarman Uḍaiyar Śrī Rājendra Coladeva I (1012—1044 A. D.) and is dated in the 31st year of his reign, *i.e.* 1043 A. D. It records the gift of 150 kāśu by Caturānana-Paṇḍita of Tiruvorriyūr for bathing the god Mahādeva of that place with clarified butter on the birthday festival of the king which fell on the asterism Tiruvātirai in the month of Mārkaḷi. This festival which commenced with Ārdra in the month of Mārkaḷi each year was an important festival of the temple and was called Rājendra Colan-Tirunāl, either in honour of the king or on account of the coincidence of the nakṣatra with that of his birthday, more probably the latter. We can hardly expect our Caturānana who was already 83 when Rājendra commenced his rule (1012) to live on till the date of this grant (1043 A. D.) which would mean that he lived for 113 years. Surely this is a later Caturānana, probably the successor of our Caturānana, who was named so after he had been initiated into the order of the maṭha of the sarṇnyāsins, in accordance with the convention of naming the incumbents with names like Sarasvatī, Bhārati, etc. known to religious orders of India. Thus it will be seen that Caturānana was an episcopal title rather than an individual name. The maṭha is mentioned in this record as "Tirumayāṇam maṭam" of which Caturānana was the head, and poet Kamban refers to this maṭha in one of his stray verses.<sup>3</sup>

Inscriptions, nos. 371 of 1911 and 206 of 1912 speak of a still later Caturānana-Paṇḍita who was a contemporary of the Cola Rājakesarivarman Tribhuvanacakravartin Rājādhirājadeva

1. *M. E. Coll.* Nos. 371 of 1911, 104 of 1912, and 206 of 1912.

2. No. 399 of 1896:—See *S. I. I.* Vol. V, no. 1354, pp. 491—2.

3. Rangacharya, *Inscriptions of the Madras Presy.*, vol. I, p. 434, no. 973.

II (1172—86 A. D.). Both are dated in the 9th year of that king. In the former the king is said to have personally attended the Paṅkūṇi-uttirām festival in the temple of Padambakka-Nāyaka-deva, *i. e.*, the shrine of Ādhipurīśvara, at Tiruvorriyūr<sup>1</sup> on which occasion were also present Caturānana-Paṇḍita who owned a maṭha in the temple and Vāgīśvara-Paṇḍita, who expounded the Soma-siddhānta doctrine. It is also said that the king heard in their company the story (Śrīpurāṇa) of Āḷudaiya-Nambi. Tiruvorriyūr was as remarked already a religious centre that attracted kings even to attend its festivals. In the latter (no. 206 of 1912) Caturānana-Paṇḍita is mentioned as the maṭhādhīpati, at whose instance the temple accountant (“Uḍaiyāṇ uravākkināṇ”, *i. e.* maitrikara) recorded gifts of lamps and cows made to the temple in previous years that were not till then engraved in stone.

Turning our attention to the Caturānana, whose earlier patron was Kṛṣṇa III we have seen that he resigned the world soon after 949 A. D., that he bathed in the Ganges which was probably in 950 A. D., that he entered the order of saṁnyāsa at Tiruvorriyūr which was probably in 951 A. D., and that he succeeded Nirañjana, his guru, thereafter, on the demise of Nirañjana which took place probably a year or two after his initiation (say 953 A. D.). Thus it is proved that he was an younger contemporary of Nirañjana, who was patronised by Vijaya Kampavarman.

Nirañjana too should have been old enough about 953 A.D.; let us say he was 60 years old, which would mean that he lived from about 893 to 953 A. D. The estimate of the late Krishna Sastri that he lived in the ninth century<sup>2</sup> would then cover only the guru's infancy and boyhood, as the later parts of his life, such as youth, old age etc. figure only in the tenth century. His patron Vijaya Kampavarman appears to have ruled for 26 years<sup>3</sup> as evidenced by a record of his dated in the 26th year of his reign from Maḍam, Wandiwash Taluk, North Arcot

1. *M. E. R.* 1912, p. 67. The name Paḍambakka-Nāyakadeva (also referred to in no. 367 of App. B.) seems to connect the shrine of Ādhipurīśvara with the serpent's hood paḍam (and confirms the statement of the priests that the god now worshipped . . . . is an ant-hill covered on all sides with a metallic protector).

2. *M. E. R.* 1913, p. 86.

3. *M. E. Coll.* no. 283 of 1919.

District. The fact that he is unknown to Kṛṣṇa III who was keen on bringing all the minor powers together so that they can support him against the Cola<sup>1</sup> proves that Vijaya Kampavarman should have lived before the advent of Kṛṣṇa III. That Nirañjana knew no other patron than Kampavarman is clear from his gift dated in the 19th year of Kampavarman's reign, which is in fact the last record of this king in the temple at Tiruvorriyūr. And this guru who lived between 893—953 A. D. would be considered to merit saṁnyāsa and the headship of the maṭha at Tiruvorriyūr and also be expected to engage himself in the work of constructing the temple of Mahādeva as he is said to have done only as a youth or as a middle-aged man commanding much influence in the country, and not as a boy. He was probably in need of royal patronage when he took up the work of temple construction after entering saṁnyāsa, which was probably when he was of sufficient age, say 33. And the corresponding year would be 926 A. D. and it was probably in this year that Kampavarman's record of the 19th year was made. If his 19th year will be equivalent to 926 A. D., his total rule which extended to 26 years will be said to run from 907—933 A. D. His rule cannot be postulated in the reign of Āditya I, for the Pallava that the latter had to fight with was Aparājita and none other. He was probably an unnoticed boy during the campaign of Āditya in the Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam and was not in a position to assert himself during the later part of Āditya's reign. Āditya appears to have retained hold of the Toṇḍai-maṇḍalam till almost his death (907 A. D.)<sup>2</sup>. Consequently the death of Āditya in or before 907 A. D. should have given occasion to Kampavarman (now a youth) to play the part of a Vijaya Pallava, which was possible, as Parāntaka I, the son of Āditya, was engaged with the Pāṇḍya and the Ceylonese kings for a long time. Thus we are tempted to give him a rule extending from 907—933 A. D.

What was the country that he ruled? Almost all his inscriptions<sup>3</sup> are located in the Chingleput, and North Arcot

1. *J. O. R.* Vol. V, pt. IV, pp. 309 n—10.

2. *M. E. R.* 1907, pt. II, paras 29—30; *E. I.*, xviii, p. 23.

3. *M. E. Coll.*, Nos. 24, 26 of 1893, 13 of 1887, 3, 5—7, 9, 42, 64, 65, 84, 85, 90 of 1898, 207, 208 of 1901, 429 of 1902, 391, 398 of 1905, 345 of 1906, 372 of 1911, 174, 189, 253 of 1912, and 283 of 1919.

districts which should have therefore constituted his dominion. Strangely however all the known inscriptions of Aparājita (870—888 A. D.) come from the same two districts,<sup>1</sup> and from no other. Kampavarman probably died in 933 A. D., the year that marked his 26th regnal year. He was probably born before 888 A. D., the year in which Āditya is said to have killed Aparājita in battle. The fact that the territory of Aparājita was taken possession of by Āditya soon after 888 A. D. may be true and no Pallava power could show itself during his life-time. The subjection of the Pallava territory to Āditya was probably in name. And when Āditya died Pallava power showed itself under Kampavarman in the same territory as Aparājita should have ruled over. This circumstance gives room to the surmise that we have probably in Kampavarman a son of Aparājita himself whose territory goes to Kampavarman as patrimony. In all probability Kampavarman was an infant boy of Aparājita when the latter was killed in 888 A. D., and some trusted nobles of Aparājita should have removed the boy to a place of safety and should have reared him up till he grew into youth and asserted the Pallava power soon after the death of Āditya, the Yama of his father. It would thus appear that he was probably born to Aparājita, in about say 885 A. D. and lived till 933 A. D. and his rule appears to have extended from about 907 to 933 A. D.

---

---

1. Nos. 351 of 1908, 435 of 1905, 31—2, 158—9, 161, 163, 180, 190 of 1912.

# HISTORY OF GRAMMATICAL THEORIES IN TAMIL

BY

DR. P. S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRI, M.A., PH. D., L.T.,

*Principal, Rajah's College of Sanskrit & Tamil Studies, Tiruvadi.*

(Continued from page 148).

The former may be translated as follows :—

When *onpatu* is combined with *pastu*, *t* is inserted before *o* of *onpatu*, *ṇ* is substituted for *n*, *pa* is dropped, *ū* is inserted after *ṇ* and *t* of *pastu* is replaced by *r*. Hence the form *tonṇūru*. (Here no mention is made of the dropping of *patu* in *onpatu*; but it seems to me that it has been dropped on account of the same word *pastu* following it.) The latter sūtra may be translated as follows:—When *onpatu* is combined with *nūru*, *t* is inserted before *o* of *onpatu*, *ḷ* is substituted for *n*, *n* of *nūru* is dropped, *ū* is replaced by *ā* followed by *ira* and *ru* is replaced by *m*. Hence *tolḷā-ira-m* = *tolḷā-y-iram*, *y* being intervocalic. (Here also no mention is made of the loss of *patu* in *onpatu*.)

These two sūtras clearly show that the derivation of the two words *tonṇūru* and *tolḷāyiram* was forgotten even at the time of Tolkāppiaṇār.

In the last but one sūtra of Eluttatikāram, Tolkāppiaṇār states that the sandhi that takes place between *uricol* and a following word, between the two members of *paṇṇu-t-lokai* and *viṇai-t-lokai*, and between a word denoting a number and the same word, does not follow the rules already mentioned, and that it must be found out from usage. (e.g. *veḷ ena veḷuttatū* becomes *veḷveḷuttatū*; *kariyatū + kutirai* becomes *karuṇkutirai*; *konra + yānai* becomes *kol-yānai*; *kollum + yānai* becomes *kol-yānai*; *pātū + pattū* becomes *paṇṇpattū* or *paṇṇpattū*.)

2.12. *Medieval Period*: 2.121. The author of Vīracōliyam explains sandhi in 18 stanzas in *Cantiṇṇaṭalam*. Instead of the terms *meypirītāṭal*, *mikutaḷ*, and *kunṇal* adopted by Tolkāppiaṇār, he respectively mentions *ādēṣa*, *āgama* and *lōṇa*. This clearly shows that he wanted to import terms current in Sanskrit grammar in preference to Tamil terms. He prefers the